



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Vireo, Black-throated Blue Warbler, Rose-breasted Grosbeak, Maryland Yellowthroat, Tennessee Warbler, Least Flycatcher. Black-poll Warbler, Nighthawk, with 5; Towhee, Magnolia Warbler, Black and White Warbler, with 4; Blue-headed Vireo, Alder Flycatcher, Hummingbird, 3; Snowbird, Pine Warbler, with 2; White-breasted Nuthatch, Downy Woodpecker, Screech Owl, Ruby-crowned Kinglet, Water Thrush, Gnatcatcher, Greater and Lesser Yellowlegs, Cedarbird, Cape May Prairie, Mourning, Canadian, Wilson, Warblers, Whip-poor-will, with one record.

The May migrants were: Downy Woodpecker, departed on the 29th; Hermit Thrush, departed on the 31st; Ruby-crowned Kinglet, departed on the 10th; Myrtle Warbler, departed on the 20th; White-throated Sparrow, departed on 23d; Yellow Palm Warbler, departed on the 22d; Black-throated Green Warbler arrived on the 5th and departed on the 24th; White-crowned Sparrow, arrived on the 9th and departed on the 21st; Indigo Bird and Gnatcatcher, arrived on the 10th; Blackburnian Warbler, Wood Pewee, Red-eyed Vireo, arrived on the 11th; Dickcissel and Greater Yellowlegs arrived on the 12th; Yellow-billed Cuckoo, arrived on the 13th; Alder Flycatcher and Cedarbird, arrived on the 14th; Bay-breasted, Black-throated Blue, Cape May, Chestnut-sided, Magnolia, Prairie Warblers, Rose-breasted Grosbeak, Redstart, Ovenbird, arrived on the 15th; Black and White Warbler, Maryland Yellowthroat, Tennessee Warbler, arrived on the 16th; Least Flycatcher, Scarlet Tanager, Lesser Yellowlegs, arrived on the 17th; Mourning and Black-poll Warblers, Nighthawk, arrived on the 19th; Canadian Warbler, arrived on the 21st; Wilson Warbler, on the 22nd; Whip-poor-will, on the 23; Hummingbird, on the 25th.

Conclusion next number.

CRITICAL NOTES OF NEW AND OLD GENERA OF PLANTS.—VII.

BY J. A. NIEUWLAND.

NUMMULARIA.

The mycologists in a number of instances seem to have been unfortunate in selecting a considerable number of hitherto uncorrected names which are invalidated by previous use. In the

time of Linnaeus it was considered wrong to have animals and plants with identical names. The later botanical codes have asserted independence from zoological nomenclature by accepting names already used for animals. None, however, dare go so far in encouraging confusion as to admit the same names in the different plant groups. Such breaches of a logical fundamental tenet have unwittingly been quite numerous. The pardoning circumstance if any has been that mycological nomenclature has not been as carefully classified as that of the higher plants. In enquiring about *Nummularia* one would be perhaps nonplussed to ask whether the fungus or the primulaceous plant was meant. Mycologists have no right to take even temporarily rejected names of higher plants and apply them to such of their phyla. This practice arises perhaps from poverty of knowledge of classical languages or inability to make good names entirely new. If, however, a botanist considers a group of plants dignified enough to receive a generic caption he should, we take it, think the matter serious enough to endow it not only with a valid name, but with at least not a stupid one. Making a new genus by giving it a diminutive ending *ella*, *ula* or *iola* particularly when the first plant was named after some botanist is a ridiculous practice showing either ignorance or lack of seriousness on the part of the nomenclator, either or both of which make the systematic botanists justly appear ridiculous to other men of science, nor will such a practice be tolerated by a more careful and discriminating future.

The name *Nummularia* was used by the older botanists of the eighteenth century or earlier, and since 1753 for a plant segregated from the genus *Lysimachia* by S. F. Gray also, i. e., *Lysimachia Nummularia* Linn. To avoid confusion its use applied subsequently for a fungus is invalid. For the latter is suggested the name *Kommamyce*.

Kommamyce, Nom. Nov.

Nummularia Tul. 8 (1861-1865) not *Nummularia* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arr. Br. Pl. II. 300 (1821) Tulasne, L. R. & C., Sel. Fung. II. (1861-1865).

Among other species we have:

Kommamyce Bulliardi (Tul).

Nummularia Bulliardi Tul.

Kommamyce lateritia (Ell. & Ev.).

Nummularia lateritia Ell. & Ev.

Among the more important names of fungi that have been antedated by use for other plants the following may be mentioned. The name *Asteridium* Sacc. is peculiarly unfortunate. Not only was there an earlier *Asteridium* Englem¹ but also an *Asteridea* Lindley, (1839). The name is but a Greek diminutive of *Aster*, and the oldest of them is at most, but a poor makeshift. There are beside an *Asterias*, several *Asteriscus*', an *Asteropsis*, *Asterioides*, and in the same family, an *Asteronia*, *Asterella*, and *Asterina*(!) all of these based on the same word with nothing but a suffix appended to give slight difference in form.

Moreover all of these are but Greek forms of *Stellaria*. To replace the untenable fungus name *Asteridium* may be suggested that of *Arberia* in honor of Agnes Arber who wrote a valuable and learned work of erudition on Herbals, their Origin and Evolution.

Arberia Nom. Nov.

Asteridium Sacc. I: 49 not *Asteridium* Englem. 1. c. (1843).

Arberia juniperina (Cke).

Asteridium juniperinum (Cke).

Arberia lepidigenoides (Ell. & Ev.).

Asteridium lepidigenoides (Ell & Ev.).

BELONIA.

Still another example quite if not more inexcusable is the fact that the mycologists have permitted the name *Belonia*, whereas even Linnaeus² himself had a genus *Bellonia*! Moreover should one be tempted to quibble about the spelling of the word i. e., with one l instead of two, Adanson³ had the Linnaean name *Bellonia* spelled with one l. Besides this the name *Belonium* with a different gender ending, is used as a name of another fungus making the chance for confusion, even if possible, still worse. When we remember that there is a *Belonidium* (Greek diminutive form) and a *Belloniella* (Latin, diminutive form) as also a *Belonopsis*, we are tempted to wonder whether the condition could be made even more ridiculous, by dedicating *all* the genera in the group to one botanist, and put numerals after them to distinguish them as they did the kings and emperors of old and no.

To replace the fungus name *Belonia* we suggest *Pradalia*

¹ Walpers, Rep. II. 958 (1843).

² Linnaeus C., Sp. Pl. ,172 (1753).

³ Adanson, M., Fam. II. 158 (1763).

after E. Pradal¹ author of a work on Cryptogams of France. The *Belonium* Sacc. has no more reason for existence than the other, but there certainly can not be two such names in one branch of plants unless the subject of mycological nomenclature is to be made or remain a ridiculous matter, deliberately tolerated by men of science.

CATHARINEA.

Saccardo's *Catharinea*² is untenable because of the moss plant name so called by Ehrhart.³ The name *Hyalospora* is, apparently suitable and significant particularly in the case of the American species.

Hyalospora Nom. Nov.

Catharinea Sacc., and of the mycologists not *Catharinea* Ehrh. (1787) l. c. (which is a moss).

Hyalospora americana Comb. Nov.

Catharinea hyalospora Ell. & Ev.

DARLUCA Cast.

There was a *Darluca* Raf. (1820)⁴ that rendered the fungus name preoccupied. It seems therefore necessary to replace the latter by another in **Kabathia**. Herman Kabath⁵ after whom we name it, was the author of a work on the flora of Gleiwitz.

Kabathia Nom. Nov.

Darluca Cast. (1842) not *Darluca* Raf. (1820) = *Faramea* of the *Rubiaceae*.

Kabathia interseminata (Wint.) Nov. Com.

Darluca interseminata Wint.

Kabathia Filum (Biv.) Nov. Comb.

Darluca Filum (Biv.) Cast.

GAUTIERA Vittadini (1831)

The name of *Gautiera* Vittadini,⁶ also written *Gautieria* is but another form of the Linnaean *Gaultheria*. It is, however,

¹ Pradal E., Cat. Plantes Crypt. Loire Infer.

² Spelled by some *Catharinia* the name is no better because the spoken word is the one that obviously must concern us in question of homonyms as it is this that is the source of confusion rather than a written one.

³ Ehrhart F., Beitrage, 1, p. 190 (1787).

⁴ Rafinesque, C. S. Am. Jr. Sc. Phys. VI, 87 (1820).

⁵ Kabath H., Flora der Umgegend von Gleiwitz (1846).

⁶ Vittadini C. Monographia Tuberacearum Med. (1831).

antedated by Rafinesque's¹ *Gautiera*, a substitute for the name proposed by Linnaeus. On the principle that even if the former name is inapplicable, the application of the latter is not thereby justifiable, we herewith propose *Uslaria* for the fungus in honor of J. J. Uslar² one of the earliest authors of a work on plant chemistry and physiology.

Uslaria Nom. Nov.

Gautiera Vitt., (1831) l. c., not *Gautiera* Raf. (1828).

Uslaria morchellaeformis (Vitt.) Nom. Nov.

Gauteria morchellaeformis Vitt.

GUEPINIA AND LAMIA

At least two cryptogams have masqueraded under this name *Guepinia*. One of these that of Hepp.³ could in no sense have the right, so it was changed to *Heppia* Naeg. The *Guepinia* Fries, moreover is untenable being preceded by that of Bastard.⁴ The *Guepinia* Fries. seems to have had a substitute suggested in *Guepiniopsis* Pat., but though a rather unsatisfactory makeshift, it were at least more in accordance with logical procedure than to have two plants with the same name.

The genus of *Entomophthorineae*⁵ called by Nowakowski *Lamia* was preceded by the use of the name *Lamia* Endlicher.⁶ Moreover there is also a *Lahmia* that might be confused. The name is at that only a feminine form of the centuries old name adopted by Linnaeus, *Lamium*. **Culicicola** is suggested to replace the homonym.

Culicicola Nom. Nov.

Lamia Nowak., l. c., not *Lamia* Endlicher, (1841) nor *Lamium* Linn.

Culicicola Culicis (A. Braun). Nov. Comb.

Lamia Culicis (A. Braun) Nowak. l. c.

¹ Med. Fl. I., 204 (1828).

Gen. 949 (1841).

² Uslar, Johann, Julius, Fragmente neuer Pflanzenkunde, Braunschweig (1794).

³ Hepp. Ph. *Guepinia* eine neue Flechtengattung, Vehr. Schw. Naturf. Gesell. XLVJJJ, 86, (2864).

⁴ Bastard. T., Supp. a l'essai Fl. Dept. Maine et Loire. 35 (1812).

⁵ Entomophthorae (Pam. Akademii umiej. ed. Krakowie 1883). Die copulation einiger Entomophthorien (Bot. Zeit. 1877).

Pages 228-290, Vol. IV., published Nov. 21, 1915.

Pages 291-338, Vol. IV., published Jan. 18, 1916.